



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/725,249	11/29/2000	Tapio Mansikkaniemi	017.38962X00	8242
7590	05/06/2005		EXAMINER	
ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS, LLP SUITE 1800 1300 NORTH SEVENTEENTH STREET ARLINGTON, VA 22209			KLINGER, SCOTT M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2153	

DATE MAILED: 05/06/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/725,249	MANSIKKANIEMI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Scott M. Klinger	2153	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 January 2005.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-19, 21-23 and 25-34 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-19, 21-23 and 25-34 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 20 and 24 have been cancelled.

Claims 1-19, 21-23, and 25-34 are pending.

Priority

No claim for priority of has been made. The effective filing date for subject matter in the application is 29 November 2000.

Response to applicant

Note: Applicant's remarks are in **bold** text. Examiner's responses are indented.

Each of the independent claims substantively recites, inter alia, a plurality of wireless devices belonging to a family or group, a server providing bulletin board or notice board service which is connected to the wireless devices and the wireless devices each include a unique identification (ID) reserved and used by the server to recognize the wireless devices belonging to the group or family. This permits each member of the group to use the same terminal which obtains access through a server to both the bulletin or notice board service and further to have access to the Internet. See the first paragraph on page 7, of the Specification. This subject matter has no counterpart in Hanson.

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., obtaining "*access through a server to both the bulletin or notice board service and further to have access to the Internet*") are not recited in the rejected claims. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Art Unit: 2153

The Examiner relies upon column 9, lines 8-11 for a teaching of each participant having a network address which is used to recognize devices belonging to the group. However, each of the independent claims recites that the recognition is performed by the server. The referenced portion of column 9 merely suggests that when an electronic form is created and sent to the server, the server then sends the form as an email message to participants to notify the participants that a "zaplet process has been initiated". It is clear that the server 6 is performing nothing more than forwarding information via email which does not meet the limitation that each of the devices include a unique identification reserved and used by the server to recognize wireless devices belonging to the group. Accordingly, the subject matter of the independent claims is not anticipated by Hanson et al.

Unique identification for participants is implied in a system in which a server manages session information for said participants. The system of Hanson is such a system, Hanson shows:

"A web server 16 is included in the server 6 to connect to the participants 1-4. is connected to the web application server 14 and can be any commercially available web server, such as an Apache server. The web server 16 is configured to manage requests from browsers at the participants 1-4, to manage session information, to send and receive forms, or zaplets transmitted to or from the participants 1-4, and to serve HTML data and static images to the participants 1-4." (Hanson, col. 6, line 65 – col. 7, line 2)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-3, 5, 11, 16, 18, 19, 21, 22, 25-27, 32, and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hanson et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,496,849, hereinafter "Hanson"). Hanson discloses an electronic media for communicating information among a group of participants.

In referring to claim 1 and 11,

- A plurality of devices:

Hanson, Fig. 1 shows a plurality of devices 1-4 connected to a network 5

- Said devices are wireless devices:

"[In Fig. 1] the network 5 may be any local or global computer network. For example, the network 5 may be ... a wireless communications network" (Hanson, col. 5, lines 64-65)

- An access point in wireless communication with said wireless devices:

An access point is inherently implied in a wireless network (Hanson, Fig. 1)

- A server connected to said access point

Hanson, Fig. 1 shows a server 6

- Said server providing bulletin board data:

"Many older P.C. e-mail clients, and all of the text e-mail clients cannot display the segment 304. These participants may receive an e-mail message with static content, and a LTRL identifying a web page at which the dynamic content may be accessed." (Hanson, col. 10, lines 23-27)

- Said wireless devices are connected to said server through said access point in order to obtain the bulletin board data therefrom pertaining to a family or group to which the wireless devices belong, each of said wireless devices having equal access to said bulletin board data:

"In general, the present invention is directed to an electronic medium that can be used to communicate information to or collaborate among a group of participants connected to a network ... In this way, the content in the dynamic content region is always current when

read by any of the participants using the electronic medium independent of a type of system or client associated with the participants.” (Hanson, col. 2, lines 26-38)

- Said wireless devices of the family or group, each including a unique identification (ID) reserved and used by the server to recognize said wireless devices belonging to the same group or family:

The devices form a group: “*Fig. 1 is a simplified diagram of a sample network including participants of a group connected to the network.*” (Hanson, col. 3, lines 49-50)

Unique identification for participants is implied in a system in which a server manages session information for said participants: “*A web server 16 is included in the server 6 to connect to the participants 1-4. is connected to the web application server 14 and can be any commercially available web server, such as an Apache server. The web server 16 is configured to manage requests from browsers at the participants 1-4, to manage session information, to send and receive forms, or zaplets transmitted to or from the participants 1-4, and to serve HTML data and static images to the participants 1-4.*” (Hanson, col. 6, line 65 – col. 7, line 2)

In referring to claim 2,

- A service provider connected to said access point for providing access to a communication network from said wireless devices.
“[In Fig. 1] the network 5 may be any local or global computer network. For example, the network 5 may be the Internet … a wireless communications network” (Hanson, col. 5, lines 64-65), connecting to the Internet inherently implies a service provider

In referring to claim 3,

- The network is the Internet:
“[In Fig. 1] the network 5 may be any local or global computer network. For example, the network 5 may be the Internet” (Hanson, col. 5, lines 64-65)

In referring to claim 5,

- A global address server connected to said access point through which said wireless devices can obtain an address of said server:

"[In Fig. 1] the network 5 may be any local or global computer network. For example, the network 5 may be the Internet" (Hanson, col. 5, lines 64-65)

Connection to the Internet inherently implies connection to the Domain Name System (DNS), which is a global address server

In referring to claim 16,

- Providing a server containing bulletin board data:

Hanson, Fig. 1 shows a server 6 with bulletin board data 7

- Connecting a plurality of devices to said server:

Hanson, Fig. 1 shows a plurality of devices (1, 2, 3, and 4) connected to server 6 via network 5

- Said devices are wireless devices:

Hanson, col. 5, lines 64-65 (see full quote above)

- Accessing said bulletin board data from said wireless devices:

Hanson, col. 2, lines 26-38 (see full quote above)

- Displaying said bulletin board data on said wireless devices as notes arranged on a screen:

Hanson, Fig. 5 shows displaying the data as notes on a screen 200

- Said wireless devices contain the address of a global address server, said wireless devices access the global address server to obtain an address of the server in order to connect thereto:

"[In Fig. 1] the network 5 may be any local or global computer network. For example, the network 5 may be the Internet" (Hanson, col. 5, lines 64-65)

Connection to the Internet inherently implies connection to the Domain Name System (DNS), which is a global address server

- Said server providing bulletin board data:

Hanson, col. 10, lines 23-27 (see full quote above)

- Said wireless devices of the family, each including a unique identification (ID) reserved and used by the server to recognize said wireless devices belonging to the family:

The devices form a group: *Hanson, col. 3, lines 49-50 (see full quote above)*

Unique identification for participants is implied in a system in which a server manages session information for said participants: *Hanson, col. 6, line 65 – col. 7, line 2 (see full quote above)*

In referring to claims 18 and 19,

- Said wireless devices are connected to said server through an access point:

"[In Fig. 1] the network 5 may be any local or global computer network. For example, the network 5 may be the Internet ... a wireless communications network" (Hanson, col. 5, lines 64-65),

An access point is a link from a wireless network to a wired network; connecting to an Internet provider from a wireless device inherently implies an access point

In referring to claim 21,

- Wireless terminals with an identifier, a gateway, an access point, and a server:

"[In Fig. 1] the network 5 may be any local or global computer network. For example, the network 5 may be the Internet ... a wireless communications network" (Hanson, col. 5, lines 64-65),

A wireless device that connects to an access point which is in turn connected to an Internet provider, inherently implies a gateway through which a server is accessed; a means to identify the terminal is inherent in a network system (Hanson, Fig. 1)

- A configuration tool in the server for managing at least some of configurable controlling functions of a browser from the terminal:

"The electronic medium may be configured using a MIME construct. The electronic medium may include a command identifying the dynamic or the static content. The electronic medium may be configured to display a plain text message corresponding to

the dynamic content, when one of the content-types cannot support the dynamic content.”

(Hanson, col. 2, lines 54-59), a configurable electronic medium inherently implies a means to configure said medium

- IDs are reserved and used by terminals belonging to the same group, each group of a unique identification of the terminals is recognized in the same server to be used by the terminals of the group:

Unique identification for participants is implied in a system in which a server manages session information for said participants: *Hanson, col. 6, line 65 – col. 7, line 2* (see full quote above)

In referring to claims 22, 32, and 33,

- A gateway coupled to the terminal for providing a wireless communication link to the terminal:

A wireless terminal that is connected to the Internet inherently implies a gateway/router coupled to said terminal

- A server coupled to the gateway for providing services and information management services to the terminal and providing:

Hanson, Fig. 1 shows a server 6 for providing services and information management services to the terminal 2

- A global unit coupled to the gateway for providing the address of the server unit, wherein activation of the terminal initiates a request to the server to establish a shared communication session:

A domain name system (DNS) server for providing information management services is inherently implied in an Internet connected system

- IDs are reserved and used by terminals belonging to the same group, each group of a unique identification of the terminals is recognized in the same server to be used by the terminals of the group:

Unique identification for participants is implied in a system in which a server manages session information for said participants: *Hanson, col. 6, line 65 – col. 7, line 2* (see full quote above)

In referring to claim 25,

- Each terminal includes a unique identification (ID), the IDs being reserved and used by terminals belonging to the same group; each of the unique identification of the terminals being recognized in the same server to be used by the terminals of the group:

Each participant has network address which is used to recognize devices belonging to the same group: “*The server 6 then sends an e-mail message to the participants listed in the network address field 103 to notify the receiving participants that a zaplet process has been initiated.*” (Hanson, col. 9, lines 8-11)

In referring to claim 26,

- Each terminal obtains an address of the server to which the terminal is connected, allowing the terminal to access services or retrieve information from the server or the Internet:

Hanson, Fig. 1 shows the terminals connect to the same server 6, it is inherently implied that the terminals will obtain the address of the server 6 in order to connect to said server 6

In referring to claim 27, when a participant updates a dynamic section of the notice board, the other participants automatically get it when they view the notice board

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanson. Although Hanson shows substantial features of the claimed invention particularly the system according to claim 3 (see 102 rejection above), Hanson does not explicitly show at least one wireless device is connected through a second access point, a second service provider, and the Internet. Nonetheless this feature is well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification to the system disclosed by Hanson as evidenced by the background of Hanson.

A person of ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of implementing the system of Hanson so as to allow the wireless devices to connect through different access points and service providers, in order to facilitate users regardless of physical location.

Claims 6 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanson in view of Mainwaring et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,351,271, hereinafter "Mainwaring").

In referring to claim 6, although Hanson shows substantial features of the claimed invention, including the system of claim 1 (see 102 rejection above), Hanson does not show resembling a physical bulletin board having notes attached thereto. Nonetheless this feature is well known in the art and would have been an obvious addition to the system disclosed by Hanson as evidenced by Mainwaring.

In analogous art, Mainwaring discloses a method and apparatus for sending and receiving lightweight messages. Mainwaring shows bulletin board data is displayed to resemble a physical bulletin board having notes attached thereto: "*FIG. 13 is a screen shot of the touch screen display 156 of a ScanBoard IDU 152. The user interface resembles a bulletin board comprising images that have been scanned into the system. The appliance's display can be in one of two*

Art Unit: 2153

states: a shared view of a group area or a local view of a single item. The shared view consists of a "pile" of potentially overlapping items, displayed in a photo-reduced, "thumbnail" form. If two items overlap, the one at the higher level occludes the one at the lower level. All users in a group area share the same shared view. When an item is displayed with a local view, the screen shows only that item, in photo-magnified form." (Mainwaring, col. 8, lines 20-31)

Given these teachings, a person of ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying the system of Hanson so as to display the notes as if they were on a physical bulletin board, such as taught by Mainwaring, in order to provide a user friendly display of the notes, emulating a bulletin board that is familiar to the user(s).

In referring to claim 9, Hanson in view of Mainwaring shows,

- Said display is changed to introduce a new note which is received from a service, that is shared with the each of said plurality of wireless devices having equal access to the service:

Hanson, Fig. 5 shows the display 200 has a Dynamic content region 210, which is updated when new notes are introduced

Claims 7, 12, and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanson in view of Mainwaring and in further view of Maurille (U.S. Patent Number 6,484,196, hereinafter "Maurille").

In referring to claim 7, although Hanson in view of Mainwaring shows substantial features of the claimed invention, including the system of claim 6 (see 103 above), Hanson in view of Mainwaring does not show notes of different colors and indicia indicating the source of said notes. Nonetheless this feature is well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification to the system disclosed by Hanson in view of Mainwaring as evidenced by Maurille.

In analogous art, Maurille discloses and Internet messaging system and method for use in

computer networks. Maurille shows:

- Different colors for the notes:

"To assist user recognition of the different message levels and the status of those messages (read, unread, etc.), the displayed embodiment employs color and icons in addition to indentation ...In the illustrated embodiment the information line of incoming messages is underlined with different colors depending on whether the message has been responded to (shown in purple) or need to be responded to (shown in blue). Alternatively, the information line of all incoming messages can be shown in one color (e.g., blue) and with underlining only when the incoming message has not yet been responded to. Note that these display features (indentation, color, icons) are not required by the present invention but are niceties to assist users in navigating the open, threaded communication board 400." (Maurille, col. 13, lines 11-28)

- Indicia indicating the source of the notes:

Figure 4B, element 245, shows the sender name for a message

Given these teachings, a person of ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying the system of Hanson in view of Mainwaring so as to employ different colors such as taught by Maurille, in order to assist users in navigating the communication board.

In referring to claims 12 and 13, although Hanson shows substantial features of the claimed invention, including the system of claim 11 (see 102 rejection above), Hanson does not show resembling a physical bulletin board having notes attached thereto. Nonetheless this feature is well known in the art and would have been an obvious addition to the system disclosed by Hanson as evidenced by Mainwaring.

In analogous art, Mainwaring discloses a method and apparatus for sending and receiving lightweight messages. Mainwaring shows bulletin board data is displayed to resemble a physical bulletin board having notes attached thereto: *Mainwaring, col. 8, lines 20-31* (see full quote above)

Given these teachings, a person of ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying the system of Hanson so as to display the notes as if they were on a physical bulletin board, such as taught by Mainwaring, in order to provide a user friendly display of the notes, emulating a bulletin board that is familiar to the user(s).

Although Hanson in view of Mainwaring shows substantial features of the claimed invention, Hanson in view of Mainwaring does not show notes of different colors and indicia indicating the source of said notes. Nonetheless this feature is well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification to the system disclosed by Hanson in view of Mainwaring as evidenced by Maurille.

In analogous art, Maurille discloses an Internet messaging system and method for use in computer networks. Maurille shows:

- Different colors for the notes:
Maurille, col. 13, lines 11-28 (see full quote above)
- Indicia indicating the source of the notes:

Figure 4B, element 245, shows the sender name for a message.

Given these teachings, a person of ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying the system of Hanson in view of Mainwaring so as to employ different colors such as taught by Maurille, in order to assist users in navigating the communication board.

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanson in view of Mainwaring and in further view of Carau (U.S. Patent Number 6,266,048, hereinafter "Carau"). Although Hanson in view of Mainwaring shows substantial features of the claimed invention, including the system of claim 6 (see 103 rejection above above), Hanson in view of Mainwaring does not show the display changing to introduce a new note, said note being typed on a virtual keyboard. Nonetheless this feature is well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification to the system disclosed by Hanson in view of Mainwaring as evidenced by Carau.

In analogous art, Carau discloses a virtual display and keyboard for computer creating by

Art Unit: 2153

projecting virtual keyboard pattern of keys onto flat, light colored surface and embodying remote sensing for determining which virtual keys are selected. Carau shows:

- The display changing to introduce a new note (The viewing of a note from a BBS inherently implies a display change, in order to view said note)
- A virtual keyboard for a inputting text (Figures 1-3 show the virtual keyboard)

Given these teachings, a person of ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying the device of Hanson in view of Mainwaring so as to allow notes to be typed on a virtual keyboard, such as taught by Carau, in order to overcome the size limitations of portable wireless devices while keeping the functionality of a full sized keyboard.

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanson in view of Patil (U.S. Patent Number 6,625,460, hereinafter “Patil”). Although Hanson shows substantial features of the claimed invention, Hanson does not show displaying indicia that indicates notes were sent using short message service. Nonetheless this feature is well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification to the system disclosed by Hanson as evidenced by Patil.

In analogous art, Patil discloses a unified messaging protocol using SMS. Patil shows said notes were sent using short message service: *“The user is provided with the capability to compose SMS messages and with the capability to compose at least one distribution list for those messages.”* (Patil, col. 2, lines 25-27)

Given these teachings, a person of ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying the system of Hanson so as to display indicia that indicates notes were sent using short message service, such as taught by Patil, in order to allow the recipient to know what type of device sent the message.

Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanson in view of Carau. Although Nishino shows substantial features of the claimed invention, including the system of claim 11 (see 102 rejection above), Hanson does not show notes being typed on a virtual keyboard. Nonetheless this feature is well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification to the system disclosed by Hanson as evidenced by Carau.

In analogous art, Carau discloses a virtual display and keyboard for computer creating by projecting virtual keyboard pattern of keys onto flat, light colored surface and embodying remote sensing for determining which virtual keys are selected. Carau shows a virtual keyboard for a inputting text (Figures 1-3 show the virtual keyboard).

Given these teachings, a person of ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying the device of Hanson so as to allow notes to be typed on a virtual keyboard, such as taught by Carau, in order to overcome the size limitations of portable wireless devices while keeping the functionality of a full sized keyboard.

Claims 15, 17, 28, and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanson in view of Maurille.

In referring to claim 15, although Hanson shows substantial features of the claimed invention, including the system of claim 11 (see 102 rejection above), Hanson does not explicitly show the bulletin board data including a list view of all messages. Nonetheless this feature is well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification to the system disclosed by Hanson as evidenced by Maurille.

In analogous art, Maurille discloses an Internet messaging system and method for use in computer networks. Maurille shows a list view of messages: Maurille, Fig. 4B shows a list view of messages in a messaging system.

Given these teachings, a person of ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying the system of Hanson so as to show the messages in a list view, such as taught by Maurille, in order to view the messages in chronological order.

In referring to claim 17, although Hanson shows substantial features of the claimed invention including the system of claim 16 (see 102 rejection above), Hanson does not show notes of different colors and indicia indicating the source of said notes. Nonetheless this feature is well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification to the system disclosed by Hanson as evidenced by Maurille.

In analogous art, Maurille discloses an Internet messaging system and method for use in computer networks. Maurille shows:

- Different colors for the notes:

Maurille, col. 13, lines 11-28 (see full quote above)

- Indicia indicating the source of the notes:

Figure 4B, element 245, shows the sender name for a message

Given these teachings, a person of ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying the system of Hanson so as to employ different colors such as taught by Maurille, in order to assist users in navigating the communication board.

In referring to claim 28, although Hanson shows substantial features of the claimed invention including the system of claim 22 (see 102 rejection above), Hanson does not show notes of different colors and indicia to help identify various parameters. Nonetheless this feature is well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification to the system disclosed by Hanson as evidenced by Maurille.

In analogous art, Maurille discloses an Internet messaging system and method for use in computer networks. Maurille shows different colors for the notes: *Maurille, col. 13, lines 11-28* (see full quote above), and indicia indicating the source of the notes: Figure 4B, element 245, shows the sender name for a message

Given these teachings, a person of ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying the system of Hanson so as to use various colors and indicia to help identify various parameters such as taught by Maurille, in order to assist users in navigating the communication board.

Art Unit: 2153

In referring to claim 29, although Hanson in view of Maurille shows substantial features of the claimed invention, Hanson in view of Maurille does not explicitly show three different indicia are displayed in an upper left hand corner of the note to indicate whether this is a note placed there manually by one of the terminals in the group, as indicated by a pencil, whether it is a note that is generated automatically by a calendar function as indicated by a small calendar, or whether this is a note generated by a short message service (SMS) of the terminal. Nonetheless this would have been an obvious design choice for the system disclosed by Hanson in view of Maurille.

The system of shows the use of icons to assist the user in recognizing the different message levels and status of the messages: "*To assist user recognition of the different message levels and the status of those messages (read, unread, etc.), the displayed embodiment employs color and icons in addition to indentation.*" (Maurille, col. 13, lines 11-14)

A person of ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of the design choice of implementing the system of Hanson in view of Maurille so as to display three different indicia in an upper left hand corner of the note to indicate whether this is a note placed there manually by one of the terminals in the group, as indicated by a pencil, whether it is a note that is generated automatically by a calendar function as indicated by a small calendar, or whether this is a note generated by a short message service (SMS) of the terminal, so as to "*assist user recognition of the different message levels and the status of those messages.*"

In referring to claim 30, Hanson in view of Maurille shows,

- A date and time are generated indicating when the notes were formulated:

Maurille, Fig. 4B shows a date and time are generated when the note was formulated (242)

Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanson in view of Dynarski et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,272,129, hereinafter Dynarski"). Hanson shows substantial features of the claimed invention, including:

- The system of claim 22 (see 102 rejection above)
- The terminal receiving downloaded configuration information of services after authentication making the terminal ready to be used:

Hanson, Fig. 5 shows a configuration of a message board that is downloaded to the terminal

However, Hanson does not explicitly show authenticating the wireless devices. Nonetheless this feature is well known in the art and would have been an obvious addition to the system disclosed by Hanson as evidenced by Dynarski.

In analogous art, Dynarski discloses dynamic allocation of wireless mobile nodes over an Internet protocol (IP) network. Dynarski shows authenticating the wireless devices: “*An example of such an authentication server is a RADIUS server (a known device) providing accounting, authorization and authentication functions for a plurality of mobile users. The Access-Request message includes a destination IP address for the wireless device that was included in the IP packet from the terminal on the network.*” (Dynarski, col. 2, lines 55-61)

Given these teachings, a person of ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying the system of Hanson so as to authenticate the wireless devices, such as taught by Dynarski, in order to provide a level of security.

Claims 31 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanson in view of Maurille and in further view of Tognazzini (U.S. Patent Number 5,790,974, hereinafter “Tognazzini”). Although Hanson shows substantial features of the claimed invention, Hanson does not show notes are automatically generated by a calendar as a reminder. Nonetheless this feature is well known in the art and would have been an obvious addition to the system disclosed by Hanson as evidenced by Tognazzini.

In analogous art, Tognazzini discloses portable calendaring device having perceptual agent managing calendar entries. Tognazzini shows messages are automatically generated by a calendar as a reminder: “*If the detected event is not traffic data, the agent 16b determines in step*

160 whether the detected event is a user message, for example a reminder message initiated by the portable calendar stored in the portable calendar memory" (Tognazzini, col. 12, lines 18-21)

Given these teachings, a person of ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying the system of Hanson so as to automatically generate notes by a calendar, such as taught by Tognazzini, in order to provide a reminder to the users.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Scott M. Klinger whose telephone number is (571) 272-3955. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00am - 5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenn Burgess can be reached on (571) 272-3949. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Scott M. Klinger
Examiner
Art Unit 2153

smk



GLENTON B. BURGESS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100